

neither enlarges nor diminishes the decision-making status of any federal or non-federal entities (see CEQ Memorandum for Heads of Federal Agencies entitled "Designation of Non-Federal Agencies to be Cooperating Agencies in Implementing the Procedural Requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act" dated 28 July 1999, available from the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), Executive Office of the President of the U.S.). In determining sufficient jurisdiction or expertise, CEQ regulations can be used as guidance.

(h) *The Army as a cooperating agency.* Often, other agencies take actions that can negatively impact the Army mission. In such cases, the Army may have some special or unique expertise or jurisdiction.

(1) The Army may be a cooperating agency (40 CFR 1501.6) in order to:

(i) Provide information or technical expertise to a lead agency.

(ii) Approve portions of a proposed action.

(iii) Ensure the Army has an opportunity to be involved in an action of another federal agency that will affect the Army.

(iv) Provide review and approval of the portions of EISs and RODs that affect the Army.

(2) Adequacy of an EIS is primarily the responsibility of the lead agency. However, as a cooperating agency with approval authority over portions of a proposal, the Army may adopt an EIS if review concludes the EIS adequately satisfies the Army's comments and suggestions.

(3) If the Army is a major approval authority for the proposed action, the appropriate Army official may sign the ROD prepared by the lead agency, or prepare a separate, more focused ROD. If the Army's approval authority is only a minor aspect of the overall proposal, such as issuing a temporary use permit, the Army need not sign the lead agency's ROD or prepare a separate ROD.

(4) The magnitude of the Army's involvement in the proposal will determine the appropriate level and scope of Army review of NEPA documents. If the Army is a major approval authority or may be severely impacted by the

proposal or an alternative, the Army should undertake the same level of review as if it were the lead agency. If the involvement is limited, the review may be substantially less. The lead agency is responsible for overall supervision of the EIS, and the Army will attempt to meet all reasonable time frames imposed by the lead agency.

(5) If an installation (or other Army organization) should become aware of an EIS being prepared by another federal agency in which they may be involved within the discussion of the document, they should notify ASA(I&E) through the chain of command. ASA(I&E) will advise regarding appropriate Army participation as a cooperating agency, which may simply involve local coordination.

§ 651.15 Mitigation and monitoring.

(a) Throughout the environmental analysis process, the proponent will consider mitigation measures to avoid or minimize environmental harm. Mitigation measures include:

(1) Avoiding the impact altogether, by eliminating the action or parts of the action.

(2) Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation.

(3) Rectifying the impact; by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the adverse effect on the environment.

(4) Reducing or eliminating the impact over time, by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action.

(5) Compensating for the impact, by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments. (Examples and further clarification are presented in Appendix C of this part.)

(b) When the analysis proceeds to an EA or EIS, mitigation measures will be clearly assessed and those selected for implementation will be identified in the FNSI or the ROD. The proponent must implement those identified mitigations, because they are commitments made as part of the Army decision. The proponent is responsible for responding to inquiries from the public or other agencies regarding the status of mitigation measures adopted in the NEPA process. The mitigation shall become a line item in the proponent's

budget or other funding document, if appropriate, or included in the legal document implementing the action (for example, contracts, leases, or grants). Only those practical mitigation measures that can reasonably be accomplished as part of a proposed alternative will be identified. Any mitigation measures selected by the proponent will be clearly outlined in the NEPA decision document, will be budgeted and funded (or funding arranged) by the proponent, and will be identified, with the appropriate fund code, in the EPR (AR 200-1). Mitigations will be monitored through environmental compliance reporting, such as the ISR (AR 200-1) or the Environmental Quality Report. Mitigation measures are identified and funded in accordance with applicable laws, regulations, or other media area requirements.

(c) Based upon the analysis and selection of mitigation measures that reduce environmental impacts until they are no longer significant, an EA may result in a FNSI. If a proponent uses mitigation measures in such a manner, the FNSI must identify these mitigating measures, and they become legally binding and must be accomplished as the project is implemented. If any of these identified mitigation measures do not occur, so that significant adverse environmental effects could reasonably be expected to result, the proponent must publish an NOI and prepare an EIS.

(d) Potential mitigation measures that appear practical, and are unobtainable within expected Army resources, or that some other agency (including non-Army agencies) should perform, will be identified in the NEPA analysis to the maximum extent practicable. A number of factors determine what is practical, including military mission, manpower restrictions, cost, institutional barriers, technical feasibility, and public acceptance. Practicality does not necessarily ensure resolution of conflicts among these items, rather it is the degree of conflict that determines practicality. Although mission conflicts are inevitable, they are not necessarily insurmountable; and the proponent should be cautious about declaring all mitigations impractical and carefully consider any manpower

requirements. The key point concerning both the manpower and cost constraints is that, unless money is actually budgeted and manpower assigned, the mitigation does not exist. Coordination by the proponent early in the process will be required to allow ample time to get the mitigation activities into the budget cycle. The project cannot be undertaken until all required mitigation efforts are fully resourced, or until the lack of funding and resultant effects, are fully addressed in the NEPA analysis.

(e) Mitigation measures that were considered but rejected, including those that can be accomplished by other agencies, must be discussed, along with the reason for the rejection, within the EA or EIS. If they occur in an EA, their rejection may lead to an EIS, if the resultant unmitigated impacts are significant.

(f) Proponents may request assistance with mitigation from cooperating non-Army agencies, when appropriate. Such assistance is appropriate when the requested agency was a cooperating agency during preparation of a NEPA document, or has the technology, expertise, time, funds, or familiarity with the project or the local ecology necessary to implement the mitigation measure more effectively than the lead agency.

(g) The proponent agency or other appropriate cooperating agency will implement mitigations and other conditions established in the EA or EIS, or commitments made in the FNSI or ROD. Legal documents implementing the action (such as contracts, permits, grants) will specify mitigation measures to be performed. Penalties against a contractor for noncompliance may also be specified as appropriate. Specification of penalties should be fully coordinated with the appropriate legal advisor.

(h) A monitoring and enforcement program for any mitigation will be adopted and summarized in the NEPA documentation (see Appendix C of this part for guidelines on implementing such a program). Whether adoption of a monitoring and enforcement program is applicable (40 CFR 1505.2(c)) and

whether the specific adopted action requires monitoring (40 CFR 1505.3) may depend on the following:

(1) A change in environmental conditions or project activities assumed in the EIS (such that original predictions of the extent of adverse environmental impacts may be too limited);

(2) The outcome of the mitigation measure is uncertain (for example, new technology);

(3) Major environmental controversy remains associated with the selected alternative; or

(4) Failure of a mitigation measure, or other unforeseen circumstances, could result in a failure to meet achievement of requirements (such as adverse effects on federal or state listed endangered or threatened species, important historic or archaeological sites that are either listed or eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places, wilderness areas, wild and scenic rivers, or other public or private protected resources). Proponents must follow local installation environmental office procedures to coordinate with appropriate federal, tribal, state, or local agencies responsible for a particular program to determine what would constitute "adverse effects."

(i) Monitoring is an integral part of any mitigation system.

(1) Enforcement monitoring ensures that mitigation is being performed as described in the NEPA documentation, mitigation requirements and penalty clauses are written into any contracts, and required provisions are enforced. The development of an enforcement monitoring program is governed by who will actually perform the mitigation: a contractor, a cooperating agency, or an in-house (Army) lead agency. Detailed guidance is contained in Appendix C of this part. The proponent is ultimately responsible for performing any mitigation activities. All monitoring results will be sent to the installation Environmental Office; in the case of the Army Reserves, the Regional Support Commands (RSCs); and, in the case of the National Guard, the NGB.

(2) Effectiveness monitoring measures the success of the mitigation effort and/or the environmental effect.

While quantitative measurements are desired, qualitative measures may be required. The objective is to obtain enough information to judge the effect of the mitigation. In establishing the monitoring system, the responsible agent should coordinate the monitoring with the Environmental Office. Specific steps and guidelines are included in Appendix C of this part.

(j) The monitoring program, in most cases, should be established well before the action begins, particularly when biological variables are being measured and investigated. At this stage, any necessary contracts, funding, and manpower assignments must be initiated. Technical results from the analysis should be summarized by the proponent and coordinated with the installation Environmental Office. Subsequent coordination with the concerned public and other agencies, as arranged through development of the mitigation plan, will be handled through the Environmental Office.

(k) If the mitigations are effective, the monitoring should be continued as long as the mitigations are needed to address impacts of the initial action. If the mitigations are ineffective, the proponent and the responsible group should re-examine the mitigation measures, in consultation with the Environmental Office and appropriate experts, and resolve the inadequacies of the mitigation or monitoring. Professionals with specialized and recognized expertise in the topic or issue, as well as concerned citizens, are essential to the credibility of this review. If a different program is required, then a new system must be established. If ineffective mitigations are identified which were required to reduce impact below significance levels (§651.35 (g)), the proponent may be required to publish an NOI and prepare an EIS (paragraph (c) of this section).

(l) Environmental monitoring report. An environmental monitoring report is prepared at one or more points after program or action execution. Its purpose is to determine the accuracy of impact predictions. It can serve as the basis for adjustments in mitigation programs and to adjust impact predictions in future projects. Further

Department of the Army, DoD

§ 651.19

guidance and clarification are included in Appendix C of this part.

§ 651.16 Cumulative impacts.

(a) NEPA analyses must assess cumulative effects, which are the impact on the environment resulting from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. Actions by federal, non-federal agencies, and private parties must be considered (40 CFR 1508.7).

(b) The scoping process should be used to identify possible cumulative impacts. The proponent should also contact appropriate off-post officials, such as tribal, state, county, or local planning officials, to identify other actions that should be considered in the cumulative effects analysis.

(c) A suggested cumulative effects approach is as follows:

(1) Identify the boundary of each resource category. Boundaries may be geographic or temporal. For example, the Air Quality Control Region (AQCR) might be the appropriate boundary for the air quality analysis, while a watershed could be the boundary for the water quality analysis. Depending upon the circumstances, these boundaries could be different and could extend off the installation.

(2) Describe the threshold level of significance for that resource category. For example, a violation of air quality standards within the AQCR would be an appropriate threshold level.

(3) Determine the environmental consequence of the action. The analysis should identify the cause and effect relationships, determine the magnitude and significance of cumulative effects, and identify possible mitigation measures.

§ 651.17 Environmental justice.

Executive Order 12898 (Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-Income Popu-

lations, 11 February 1994, 3 CFR, 1994 Comp., p. 859) requires the proponent to determine whether the proposed action will have a disproportionate impact on minority or low-income communities, both off-post and on-post.

Subpart C—Records and Documents

§ 651.18 Introduction.

NEPA documentation will be prepared and published double-sided on recycled paper. The recycled paper symbol should be presented on the inside of document covers.

§ 651.19 Record of environmental consideration.

A Record of Environmental Consideration (REC) is a signed statement submitted with project documentation that briefly documents that an Army action has received environmental review. RECs are prepared for CXs that require them, and for actions covered by existing or previous NEPA documentation. A REC briefly describes the proposed action and timeframe, identifies the proponent and approving official(s), and clearly shows how an action qualifies for a CX, or is already covered in an existing EA or EIS. When used to support a CX, the REC must address the use of screening criteria to ensure that no extraordinary circumstances or situations exist. A REC has no prescribed format, as long as the above information is included. To reduce paperwork, a REC can reference such documents as real estate Environmental Baseline Studies (EBSSs) and other documents, as long as they are readily available for review. While a REC may document compliance with the requirements of NEPA, it does not fulfill the requirements of other environmental laws and regulations. Figure 3 illustrates a possible format for the REC as follows: